

Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., referee comment RC2
<https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2022-55-RC2>, 2022
© Author(s) 2022. This work is distributed under
the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.

Comment on nhess-2022-55

Anonymous Referee #2

Referee comment on "Invited perspectives: Views of 350 natural hazard community members on key challenges in natural hazards research and the Sustainable Development Goals" by Robert Šakić Trogrlić et al., Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2022-55-RC2>, 2022

The manuscript shows perspectives from the wider natural hazards community on key challenges within their scientific field. The study builds on a questionnaire survey conducted online with the journal's wider community. The results are consistent with the relevant literature, but add little new knowledge. However, they provide an additional comprehensive picture of the natural hazard community. The manuscript is overall well written and comprehensible. I recommend a minor revision prior to publication. In detail:

- Line 14: The reader would have a better introduction to the manuscript if the authors already added the key findings (like in line 480-486) briefly in the abstract.
- Line 33: Who do the authors mean by "our"? The authors of the manuscript? The community? Or the current state of science? Please specify.
- Line 34: What is the background to this list? Is it based on a discussion between the authors or a comprehensive analysis of the literature? Even if it is stated as not complete, adding some more items might be necessary. One thing to mention is the issue of warnings and forecasts (e.g. the importance of social media), which is of deeper relevance in the later course of the manuscript and the discussion of the results. Overall, a deeper engagement with existing literature on key challenges would be useful.
- Line 56: The abbreviation DRR is used here for the first time without further explanation.
- Line 139 (Point 4): Was the analysis carried out equally by all authors? Can we speak of consensual coding?
- Line 462: Interestingly despite the more physical science background, lots of the comments are on social issues and the integration of disciplines. It would be interesting to read the thoughts of the authors on this issue.